

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)

DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE
April 11, 2001
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Introduction.....	1
Work Planning	2
Identification of Topics for Upcoming Meetings	3
Conclusion	4
Handouts	4
Attendees.....	5

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Introduction

The committee decided to postpone leadership selection and renaming itself until more members arrived; several people had called to say they would be late, due to transportation problems. However, for clarity of this summary the results of these discussions (which took place near the end of the meeting) were as follows: operating by consensus, the committee selected Amber Waldref as chair, Bill Kinsella as vice-chair, and decided to call itself the Public Involvement and Communication Committee.

Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, distributed a handout ('Key Decision Points for Restructuring Proposal Adopted at April 6, 2001 Board Meeting') that summarized the major principles of committee restructuring. Ms. Siguenza reminded the committee that the Board had adopted these principles at the previous Board meeting, then briefly summarized the changes. She pointed out that leadership positions are limited to one position per person. Committee week will occur ten months out of the year (with December and one summer month off) in a Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday block the second week of the month. Advice processes were adopted for leisurely and expedited circumstances. Cross-cutting issues will be assigned one lead committee, which will coordinate with other involved committees in order to increase efficiency. An Executive Issues Committee (EIC) – composed of the HAB chair and vice chair, either the chair or vice-chair of each committee, and rotating issue managers from each committee – will assign committee meeting days and times. All committees must complete detailed work plans, which will be used to justify meeting time requests. The goals of restructuring were to make the committees flexible and efficient, operating under the guiding principle that the work drives committee meetings.

Work Planning

The committee started to identify issues on which it intends to focus over the next few months. Ruth Siguenza distributed the following handouts: “Possible Topics for June Meeting (brainstormed at April 2001 HAB meeting),” “Issues Assignment – Issues that clearly reside in one committee (Attachment 2),” “Cross-cutting Issues Assignment (Attachment 3),” and “Committee Work Planning Table (blank).” Ms. Siguenza suggested that the committee begin by elaborating the work planning details for issues that clearly reside in one committee (Handout Attachment 2).

Since the committee identified only a few long-term issues of its own, one member suggested assigning liaisons to the other four committees. The liaisons could alert the PIC Committee of the need for public involvement activities as they arise in other committees. The liaisons would serve as a conduit for issue managers and cooperation between committees on cross-cutting issues. The committee agreed to this proposal. Liaisons to the four other committees were assigned and are listed below.

Committee	PIC Liaison
River and Plateau	Madeleine Brown
Tank Waste	Paige Knight
Budgets and Contracts	Gerry Pollet
Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection	Jim Trombold

Next the committee started to outline work planning on its own issues. The first issue the committee tackled was the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Community Relations plan. Marla Marvin, DOE-Richland Operations Office (RL), explained that the TPA requires the Community Relations Plan to be revised every few years. DOE-RL has revised the plan and would like the committee to review it. She reported that DOE-RL did not make any substantive changes on the plan, but updated information and added web site addresses. Ms. Marvin’s request led to a discussion about the need to improve the quality and effectiveness of public meetings, rather than just meeting agency requirements. Joy Turner, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), informed the committee that the TPA agencies hope to discuss public communications in the June meeting, so it would be helpful to get feedback from the committee. The committee included Evaluation of Public Involvement Activities as a topic on its work plan. This led to a query by Jim Trombold about the mission statement for the committee. The committee agreed that it should be reviewed and added the issue to its work plan.

Peter Bengston, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), speaking on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), suggested adding an issue to this list. DOE-ORP is developing an Openness Policy and would like the committee’s input on a draft that will be available in June. The policy is intended to describe how DOE-ORP openly communicates internally as well as externally. Mr. Bengston offered to distribute copies to committee members (in advance) for a

presentation and review in June. A committee member asked how DOE-ORP's plan is different than the general U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Office (DOE-RL) policy that the committee had previously reviewed. Mr. Bengston explained that when the Regulatory Unit came over to DOE-ORP, it had its own very rigorous, detailed openness policy. Harry Boston, DOE-ORP, wanted the policy integrated across all of DOE-ORP. The policy may borrow from DOE-RL's policy but is not necessarily the same.

The committee agreed to consider the issue, then continued with its work planning, focusing now on cross-cutting issues on which had not been identified as the lead committee. Gail McClure, DOE-RL, spoke on behalf of Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), who had asked her to solicit the committee's opinion on whether there is broad interest outside the Tri-Cities area for public meetings about the B Reactor Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA).

The committee raised concerns about issue managers attending other committee's meetings and whether their travel would be covered. Gail McClure, DOE-RL, said that travel is only reimbursed for attending the two committees on which you are a primary member.

Identification of Topics for Upcoming Meetings

Next the committee discussed topics it intends to cover at its next meeting, and how much time should be allocated for each. Ruth Siguenza explained that the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) has a conference call scheduled for 3:00 pm on Tuesday, April 17th and at that time the committee meeting times will be decided. The committee decided that it should meet on a day adjacent to the River and Plateau Committee so the two committees can discuss the low-level burial trench environmental assessment cross-cutting issue. In addition, committee members requested that all members be polled for meeting-day preference. The committee also discussed its past meeting habits and whether it should keep those or start over. In the past the committee met four times a year on the Wednesday afternoon before Board meetings. This was to save travel expenses and to accommodate TPA agency quarterly public involvement meetings. The committee expressed a desire to have a hard-wired meeting day. Ms. Siguenza reminded the committee to let its workload guide meeting frequency.

Topics identified for next meeting:

- Review committee mission
 - Issue manager = Jim Trombold
- Continue work planning
- Evaluation of public involvement
 - Outline the concept
- Community Relations Plan (CRP)
 - Discuss/respond to DOE-RL
- Low-Level Waste Burial Ground Environmental Assessment

- Cross-cutting issue with River and Plateau Committee; cover this topic in a joint meeting
- B Reactor Museum
 - Cross-cutting issue with River and Plateau Committee; cover this topic in a joint meeting

The committee estimated it needed a four-hour meeting (half-day) in May to cover the issues on which it has the lead; the two cross-cutting issues are proposed to be covered during the River and Plateau Committee's time.

Conclusion

Ruth Siguenza requested that committee members submit their comments on previous meeting summaries to the facilitation team within one week. In the future, meeting summaries will be adopted at the subsequent committee meeting, but due to the reorganization there were a few orphan meeting summaries awaiting approval from now non-existent committees.

Before the meeting ended a member of the public addressed the committee. Walt Gresham, President of the Hanford Heritage, had attended the meeting and wanted to convey that the Hanford site is an example of poor communication. He said that the public has needed in the past and continues to need to know more about activities on the site. He pointed out that the excessive use of acronyms makes much of the communication regarding Hanford incomprehensible to the average member of the public. Acronyms make many people apprehensive and confused and perpetuate the impression of secrecy at the site. Mr. Gresham expressed amazement that the committee was questioning whether there should be a museum at the B Reactor. He thought there should be a riverboat to show people the history of the area before Hanford was made into a government site.

Gerry Pollet responded by pointing out that history began in this area with the Native Americans, who are now among the many constituencies with differing views on whether the museum should be built. He explained that given the needs for Hanford cleanup funding, many people question the wisdom a museum 40 miles from Richland that is still contaminated.

Chair Amber Waldref adjourned the meeting, after committing to poll committee members for their preferred meeting day.

Handouts

- Hanford Advisory Board Committee Lists, Updated March 20, 2001 for Public Communication Committee
- Public Communications Committee Draft Meeting Agenda, Revised April 10, 2001
- Possible Topics for June Meeting (brainstormed at April 2001 HAB meeting), April 10, 2001

- Issues Assignment – Issues that clearly reside in one committee (Attachment 2), February 20, 2001
- Cross-cutting Issues Assignment (Attachment 3), February 20, 2001
- Key Decision Points for Restructuring Proposal Adopted at April 6, 2001 Board Meeting, April 6, 2001
- Committee Work Planning Table (blank), April 10, 2001
- River and Plateau Committee Work Planning Table – Issue Manager assignments determined at 4/10/01 meeting
- Washington State Department of Ecology’s “Tri-Party Agencies Public Involvement Evaluation May 2000,” August 2000
- Strikethrough version of Community Relations Plan Revisions, April 11, 2001

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Martin Bensky	Madeleine Brown	Norma Jean Germond
Bill Kinsella	Paige Knight	Wanda Munn
Gerry Pollet	Betty Tabbutt (phone)	Jim Trombold
Amber Waldref		

Others

Marla Marvin, DOE-RL	Joy Turner, Ecology	Nancy Myers, BHI
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique, Inc.
		Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues
		Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
		Barb Wise, FH
		Walt Gresham, Hanford Heritage
		Peter Bengston, PNNL